

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:
ROBERT C. HYTA
WELLS ST. JOHN, P.S.
601 WEST FIRST STREET, SUITE 1300
SPOKANE, WA 99201-3828

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year) 10 NOV 2005	
Applicant's or agent's file reference PC3-154	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/US05/02617	International filing date (day/month/year) 28 January 2005 (28.01.2005)
Priority date (day/month/year) 30 January 2004 (30.01.2004)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): C07C 21/18; A01N 29/02; A01K 31/02 and US Cl.: 514/743, 757, 759; 570/101, 123, 124, 134, 137	
Applicant PC BU SERVICES, INC.	

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

EV 8 3 2 8 3 5 2 9 0

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Date of completion of this opinion 03 November 2005 (03.11.2005)	Authorized officer Lansana Nyalley Telephone No. (571) 272-1600
--	---	---

Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (April 2005)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US05/02617

10/587344

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

- ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
- ☐ a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
- ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ on paper
- ☐ in electronic form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US05/02617

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>5, 6, 8-28</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-4, 7</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>5, 15, 22-23</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-4, 6-14, 16-21, 24-28</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-28</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-4 and 7 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Peavy (US Patent 5,310,870). Peavy discloses fluorocarbon telomers and their synthesis (see column 4, Table 1).

Claims 6, 8-14, 16-21 and 24-28 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Van Der Puy et al. (US Patent 5,395,997) in combination with Mallikarjuna et al. (US Patent 6,031,141) and further in view of Caporiccio et al. (US Patent 4,833,274) and Probst et al. (US Patent 4,706,205).

The difference between the prior arts of record and the claims of the instant application is that the position of the CF₃-substituted in the taxogen of the prior art is mostly on carbon one of the chain of the reactant whereas the said substituent is mostly on the second or third carbon in the chain of the taxogen reactant. These compounds are positional isomer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an appropriate starting material in order to make a desired isomer. One of ordinary skill in the art will be motivated to so base on the need of the desired molecule.

Claims 5, 15 and 22-23 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the claimed invention.

Claims 1-28 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.